arXiv:1409.3693v1 [astro-ph.HE] 12 Sep 2014

Estimation of the Extragalactic Background Light using TeV Observations of BL Lacs

Atreyee Sinha[1], S. Sahayanathan[2], R. Misra[3], S. Godambe[2], B. S. Acharya[1]

Received _____; accepted _____

[1]Department of High Energy Physics, Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Homi Bhabha Road, Mumbai 400005, INDIA;{atreyee,acharya}@tifr.res.in

[2]Astrophysical Sciences Division, Bhabha Atomic Research Center, Mumbai, India; {sunder,gsagar}@barc.ernet.in

[3]Inter-University Center for Astronomy and Astrophysics, Post Bag 4, Ganeshkhind, Pune-411007, India; rmisra@iucaa.ernet.in

ABSTRACT

The very high energy (VHE) gamma ray spectral index of high energy peaked blazars correlates strongly with its corresponding redshift whereas no such correlation is observed in the X-ray or the GeV bands. We attribute this correlation to a result of photon-photon absorption of TeV photons with the extragalactic background light (EBL) and utilizing this, we compute the allowed flux range for the EBL, which is independent of previous estimates. The observed VHE spectrum of the sources in our sample can be well approximated by a power-law, and if the de-absorbed spectrum is also assumed to be a power law, then we show that the spectral shape of EBL will be $\epsilon n(\epsilon) \sim klog(\frac{\epsilon}{\epsilon_p})$. We estimate the range of values for the parameters defining the EBL spectrum, k and ϵ_p, such that the correlation of the intrinsic VHE spectrum with redshift is nullified. The estimated EBL depends only on the observed correlation and the assumption of a power law source spectrum. Specifically, it does not depend on the spectral modeling or radiative mechanism of the sources, nor does it depend on any theoretical shape of the EBL spectrum obtained through cosmological calculations. The estimated EBL spectrum is consistent with the upper and lower limits imposed by different observations. Moreover, it also agrees closely with the theoretical estimates obtained through cosmological evolution models.

Subject headings: galaxies: intergalactic medium, BL Lacertae objects: general, cosmology:cosmic background radiation, infrared: diffuse background

1. Introduction

The extragalactic background light (EBL) is an isotropic diffuse radiation field extending from Ultraviolet (UV) to Infrared (IR) wavelength ($\lambda = 0.1 - 1000\mu m$). It is the relic

radiation containing information about the structure formation epoch of the universe and hence, is an important cosmological quantity (Dwek & Krennrich 2013; De Angelis et al. 2013). The main contributors of the EBL spectrum are the stellar emission (peaking at optical-UV) and the dust emission (peaking at IR). Direct measurement of EBL is very difficult due to strong foreground contamination by the Galactic and zodiacal light, and depends on the choice of the zodiacal light models (Kelsall et al. 1998; Wright 1998). However, different upper and lower limits on EBL, based on various observations and deep galaxy number counts, have been put forth (Hauser et al. 1998; Madau & Pozzetti 2000; Domínguez et al. 2011; Helgason & Kashlinsky 2012). Theoretical prediction of the spectral energy distribution (SED) of EBL can be obtained by evolving stellar populations and galaxies under various cosmological initial conditions (Primack et al. 2005; Stecker et al. 2006; Franceschini et al. 2008; Gilmore et al. 2009; Finke et al. 2010; Kneiske & Dole 2010). However, such models involve a large number of parameters and the estimated EBL spectrum depends upon the underlying assumptions (Figure 1) (Hauser & Dwek 2001; de Angelis et al. 2009; Dwek & Krennrich 2013).

Alternatively, indirect estimation of EBL intensity can be obtained by studying the very high energy (VHE) gamma ray (E $> 100GeV$) spectrum of distant blazars, a class of Active Galactic Nuclei for which the relativistic jet is aligned close to the line of sight of the observer (Urry & Padovani 1995). The VHE photons emitted from blazars are absorbed en-route by forming electron-positron pairs on interaction with the EBL photons, thereby causing the observed spectrum to differ significantly from the intrinsic one. The EBL intensity can thus be estimated from gamma ray observations of blazars under various assumptions of the intrinsic spectrum (Madau & Phinney 1996; Coppi & Aharonian 1999). Assuming that the EBL spectral shape is described by the theoretical estimates, Stanev & Franceschini (1998) used the VHE spectrum of Mkn501 during a flare to constrain the overall EBL intensity and corresponding spectral index. Aharonian et al. (2006a) set an upper limit on the EBL intensity by assuming that the intrinsic VHE spectral index of blazars cannot be harder than 1.5. Similar upper limits on EBL have

been put forward by various authors, based on allowed hardness of the intrinsic VHE spectrum (Guy et al. 2000; Mazin & Raue 2007; Orr et al. 2011).

The EBL estimated from the VHE spectra of blazars often depends heavily on the underlying blazar emission models, though their broadband emission is still not well understood. The SED of blazars is dominated by a non-thermal spectrum extending from radio-to-gamma rays and are characterized by two peaks, with the low energy spectrum peaking at IR–X-ray and the high energy spectrum peaking at gamma rays (Ghisellini 2011). They are further classified as BL Lac objects and flat spectrum radio quasars (FSRQ), where FSRQ show strong emission and/or absorption lines, while such features are absent/weak in the former. Depending upon the location of the low energy peak, BL Lacs are further subdivided into low energy peaked BL Lacs (LBL), intermediate energy peaked BL Lacs (IBL) and high energy peaked BL Lacs (HBL) (Fossati et al. 1998; Ghisellini 2011). The low energy emission from BL Lacs is generally interpreted as synchrotron emission from a non-thermal distribution of electrons losing their energy in a magnetic field, while the high energy emission mechanism is still under debate. Under leptonic origin, this emission is modeled as inverse Compton scattering of soft target photons by the same electron distribution responsible for the low energy emission, whereas in hadronic models, the high energy emission is an outcome of hadronic processes from a region with energetic protons. The constraints available through present observations are not sufficient enough to differentiate between these models satisfactorily (Böttcher 2007).

Before 2000, the number of blazars detected at VHE energies were few(~ 4), primarily due to low sensitivity of first generation atmospheric Cherenkov telescopes (Costamante & Ghisellini 2002). However, with the advent of new generation high sensitivity telescopes, namely VERITAS, MAGIC and HESS, the number of blazars detected at this energy are more than 50[4]. Hence the present period allows one to perform a statistical study of VHE blazars to estimate the

[4]www.tevcat.uchicago.edu

EBL, independent of various emission models. A study of similar kind has been performed by Ackermann et al. (2012) using blazars detected by the *Fermi*-LAT, a satellite based gamma ray experiment. They used the GeV spectrum of ~ 150 blazars to estimate the EBL at UV–optical wavelengths.

In this work, we utilize a novel method to estimate the EBL spectrum at IR energies from the observed VHE spectrum of HBL. First, we show that the observed VHE spectral index of HBL correlates well with the redshift. We attribute this correlation to a result of EBL absorption, since such correlations are not seen in other wavebands. The observed spectrum of all the sources in our sample can be well described by a power law. Considering the source spectrum also as a power law, we show that this is expected for a particular shape of EBL (Stecker & Scully 2006). The parameters defining the EBL spectrum are then constrained by nullifying the correlations of the intrinsic VHE spectral index with redshift.

In the next section, we present our correlation study between the observed spectral indices and redshift to show the presence of EBL induced absorption on VHE spectra of blazars. In §3, we describe the formalism used to estimate the EBL using the correlation study and in §4, we discuss the implications of the results. A cosmology with $\Omega_M = 0.3$, $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.7$ and $H_0 = 71\, km\, s^{-1}\, Mpc^{-1}$ is used in this work.

2. EBL signature on VHE Spectra

The effect of the absorption of VHE photons by the EBL is to steepen the VHE spectra, hence providing a signature of the EBL (Vassiliev 2000; Mankuzhiyil et al. 2010). Since sources at higher redshifts are more affected by absorption; their average spectra are expected to be steeper than the lower redshift ones. To investigate this, we perform a correlation study between

the VHE spectral index[5] Γ, and redshift for a homogeneous set of sources which are detected at VHE. We select all HBL detected by the HESS, MAGIC and VERITAS telescopes with known redshifts and measured spectral index. We restrict our sample to only HBL since an intrinsic systematic hardening with source type, from FSRQ to HBL, has been observed at the GeV energies (Ackermann et al. 2011); moreover, a non-homogeneous sample may lead to spurious correlations. This restricts the farthest source in the sample to be 1ES 0414+009 at a redshift of z = 0.287. In Table 1, we list all the HBL detected at VHE along with ones for which the redshift information is uncertain (lower group). Again from the list, we group 8 HBL (middle group), due to their unusual properties. The de-absorbed VHE spectral index of these sources, obtained considering various EBL models, suggests their spectrum is extremely hard with index < 2 (Tavecchio 2014; Tanaka et al. 2014). Moreover, these sources are less luminous compared to other HBL with their synchrotron spectrum peaking at energies $> 10keV$. Due to these peculiar properties, these sources have been classified as extreme HBL (EHBL) and occupy a distinct position in the so called blazar sequence (Costamante & Ghisellini 2002).

In Figure 2, we show the variation of Γ with redshift for all the sources listed in Table 1. A Spearman rank correlation analysis on all these sources, with known redshift, shows that they are well correlated with a rank correlation coefficient, $rs = 0.58$, corresponding to a null hypothesis probability of $P_{rs} = 9.4 \times 10^{-4}$. Repeating the study with EHBL removed from the list improves the correlation considerably, with $rs = 0.75$, corresponding to $P_{rs} = 8.02 \times 10^{-5}$. Hence this study again suggests that, probably, EHBL can be treated as a separate class of HBL. However, poor statistics does not let one to assert this inference strongly.

Although the redshift range of the sample is small, a positive correlation may also occur due to rapid redshift evolution of HBL, such that the intrinsic VHE spectral index increases with redshift. If so, then the redshift evolution should be expected to have an effect on the spectral

[5]We define the spectral index, Γ, such that $dN/dE \propto E^{-\Gamma}$ [$ph/cm^2/sec/TeV$]

shape at other wavelengths. To examine this possibility, we further studied the correlation between X-ray spectral indices with redshift for HBL [6] using

a) 70 months of *Swift*-BAT catalog consisting of 27 HBL (Baumgartner et al. 2013),

b) six year *Beppo*SAX catalog consisting of 39 HBL (Donato et al. 2005) and

c) archival X-ray catalog from ASCA, EXOSAT, *Beppo*SAX, ROSAT and EINSTEIN consisting of 61 HBL (Donato et al. 2001).

We found no evidence of any correlation of the X-ray spectral index with redshift and obtained the rank correlation coefficient and null hypothesis probability for the chosen set of catalogs as, a) $rs = 0.05$ and $P_{rs} = 0.79$ (*Swift*-BAT), b) $rs = -0.07$ and $P_{rs} = 0.67$ (*Beppo*SAX) and c) $rs = 0.03$ and $P_{rs} = 0.7$ (archival). The plot of X-ray index vs. redshift for these three catalogs is given in Figure 3. Spearman rank correlation study was also performed between low energy gamma ray (GeV) spectral index and redshift for the 62 HBL listed in the second catalog of *Fermi*-LAT (Ackermann et al. 2011). For this, we obtained $rs = 0.02$ with $P_{rs} = 0.85$, suggesting that these quantities are uncorrelated. Hence, these studies violate the conjecture on redshift evolution of the spectral index of HBL, and instead support the steepening of VHE spectral index as a result of EBL absorption.

The observed correlation between the VHE spectral index and redshift could be due to selection effects. The luminosity is expected to correlate with redshift due to Malmquist bias, and if the index correlates with VHE luminosity then a correlation with redshift may occur. However, for the HBL observed by MAGIC (de Angelis et al. 2009), while the VHE luminosity does correlate with redshift as expected, there is no significant correlation between the VHE index and luminosity. Here we restricted our sample only to MAGIC detected HBL as the threshold energy is different for each experiment. This correlation is shown in Figure 4 and a Spearman

[6]In this work, we restrict our sample of HBL to only those with z<0.5, consistent with our VHE-HBL sample

rank analysis gives $rs = 0.26$ and $P_{rs} = 0.34$. At X-ray energies, the correlation study between the spectral index and X-ray luminosity resulted in a) $rs = -0.07$ and $P_{rs} = 0.15$ (*Swift*-BAT catalog) b) $rs = -0.20$ and $P_{rs} = 0.16$ (*Beppo*SAX catalog) and c) $rs = -0.14$ and $P_{rs} = 0.28$ (archival). Similarly, correlation study between GeV spectral index and luminosity for the HBL from *Fermi*-LAT catalog gives $rs = 0.11$ and $P_{rs} = 0.37$. Based on this study, we can exclude the possibility of selection effect in the observed correlation between the VHE spectral index and redshift. Significant correlation between the difference of the VHE index and the one measured by *Fermi*-LAT with redshift was reported by several authors (Stecker & Scully 2010; Prandini et al. 2010; Sanchez et al. 2013). For the HBL listed in Table 1 (top group), we also observed significant correlation between these quantities with $rs = 0.71$ and $P_{rs} = 2.2 \times 10^{-4}$; however, this correlation is weaker than the one between VHE spectral index and redshift.

Based on these studies, it is quite evident that the correlation between VHE spectral index and redshift can be attributed solely due to the effect of EBL induced absorption and that the intrinsic spectral index is uncorrelated with redshift.

3. EBL Estimation

The observed VHE spectra of the HBL are well reproduced by a power law, and hence the observed flux, $F_o(E_i)$, from a source at redshift z will be

$$\begin{aligned} F_o(E_i) &= F_i(E_i) e^{-\tau(E_i,z)} \\ &\propto E_i^{-\Gamma} \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $F_i(E_i)$ is the de-absorbed flux at energy E_i and τ, the optical depth due to EBL absorption given by (Gould & Schréder 1967a)

$$\tau(E_i, z) = \int_0^z dz' \frac{dl}{dz'} \int_{-1}^{1} d\mu \frac{(1-\mu)}{2} \int_{\epsilon_{th}}^{\infty} d\epsilon_{z'} n(\epsilon_{z'}, z') \sigma_{\gamma\gamma}(E_i, \epsilon_{z'}, \mu) \tag{2}$$

Here,

$$\frac{dl}{dz'} = \frac{c}{H_0}\frac{1}{(1+z')\sqrt{\Omega_\Lambda + \Omega_M(1+z')^3}}, \tag{3}$$

is the distance traveled by a photon per unit redshift with c as the velocity of light, n is the number density of the EBL photon of energy $\epsilon_{z'}[= \epsilon_0(1+z')]$ at redshift z', corresponding to a photon energy ϵ_0 at $z = 0$, ϵ_{th} $[= 2m_e^2c^4\ (1+z')/(E_i(1-\mu))]$ is the threshold soft photon energy with μ the cosine of the interaction angle and the pair production cross section, $\sigma_{\gamma\gamma}$, is given by

$$\sigma_{\gamma\gamma}(E,\epsilon,\mu) = \frac{2\pi\alpha^2}{3m_e^2}(1-\beta^2) \times \left[2\beta(\beta^2-2) + (3-\beta^4)\, ln\left(\frac{1+\beta}{1-\beta}\right)\right] \tag{4}$$

with $\beta(E,\epsilon) = \sqrt{1-(2\ m_e^2\ c^4)/(\epsilon\, E\,(1-\mu))}$ being the speed of the electron/positron in the centre of mass frame, α is the fine structure constant and m_e is the electron rest mass. Since VHE sources are detected only at low redshifts, one can neglect the evolution of EBL and hence (Madau & Phinney 1996),

$$n(\epsilon_z, z) \approx (1+z)^3 n(\epsilon_z) \tag{5}$$

For an isotropic EBL distribution, the angle integrated cross section (Gould & Schréder 1967b; Brown et al. 1973)

$$\bar{\sigma}_{\gamma\gamma}(E\epsilon) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{-1}^{1} d\mu(1-\mu)\sigma_{\gamma\gamma}(E,\epsilon,\mu) \tag{6}$$

peaks at $E\epsilon = 3.56\ m_e^2\ c^4$. Approximating $\bar{\sigma}_{\gamma\gamma}$ as a delta function along with $E_z \approx E_i$ and $\epsilon_z \approx \epsilon_0$, equation (2) can be simplified to

$$\tau(E,z) \approx A_{\gamma\gamma}\,\epsilon\, n(\epsilon) f(z) \tag{7}$$

where $A_{\gamma\gamma}(\approx 3.7 \times 10^{-26}\, cm^2)$ is a constant, $\epsilon \approx \frac{3.6\, m_e^2c^4}{E}$ and $f(z)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} f(z) &= \int_0^z dz' \frac{dl}{dz'}(1+z')^3 \\ &\approx \frac{c}{H_0} z \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

If the source spectrum is assumed to be a power-law, $F_i(E) \propto E^{-\zeta}$, then using equations (1) and (7) we obtain

$$\epsilon\, n(\epsilon) = k\, ln\left(\frac{\epsilon_p}{\epsilon}\right) \tag{9}$$

where $k = \frac{\Gamma-\zeta}{A_{\gamma\gamma}\, f(z)}$ and $\epsilon_p \approx \frac{3.56\, m_e^2 c^4}{E^\star}$ are source independent constants with $E^\star$ being the energy of the gamma ray photon at which the EBL induced absorption is negligible. While this form of the EBL spectrum is derived for the approximate optical depth equation (7), we have verified numerically that for the range of redshifts considered here, this EBL spectral shape will result in a nearly power-law observed spectrum. In particular, we have verified that if the EBL spectra is defined by equation (9) and the absorption optical depth is given by equation (2), the observed VHE spectrum for a source at $z = 0.3$ can be well described as a power-law. The deviation from a power-law for sources with $z < 0.3$ is less than 10 %. Hence for all calculations in this work we have used equation (2) for the optical depth. It may be noted that Stecker & Scully (2006) obtained a similar form of the optical depth while approximating a theoretical EBL spectrum by an analytic expression. However, here we arrive at this form of the EBL spectrum equation (9) only from the criterion that both the intrinsic and absorbed VHE spectra are well described by a power-law and hence our approach is independent of any cosmological calculations.

The EBL spectrum given by equation (9) is characterized by two constants, namely k and ϵ_p, which in turn determines the source spectral index. Since the source spectral index should be uncorrelated with redshift (§2), the allowed range of k and ϵ_p is restricted. For $k = 2.4 \times 10^{-3} cm^{-3}$ and $\epsilon_p = 4.6$ eV, we found that the computed source spectral indices, for the sources listed in Table 1 (top group), turn out to be "most" uncorrelated with $rs = 0.001$ and a maximum null hypothesis probability $P_{rs} = 0.99$. Within $1 - \sigma$ confidence limit, corresponding to $P_{rs} > 0.33$, we obtained the range of k and ϵ_p as $2.2^{+1.6}_{-0.7} \times 10^{-3}\, cm^{-3}$ and $4.6^{+4.4}_{-3.4}\, eV$, respectively. The resultant EBL spectrum, consistent with these values of k and ϵ_p, is plotted in Figure 1 along with the constraints derived from various observations (Dwek & Krennrich 2013) and other theoretical

estimates (Gilmore et al. 2009; Franceschini et al. 2008; Finke et al. 2010; Kneiske & Dole 2010). If we consider all the HBL with known redshift in Table 1 (top and middle group), the $1-\sigma$ confidence limit of k and ϵ_p are $2.8^{+2.6}_{-1.8} \times 10^{-3}\, cm^{-3}$ and $5.2^{+4.8}_{-4.0}\, eV$, respectively.

Alternatively, a linear fit over source spectral index versus redshift can be used to constrain the constants k and ϵ_p. A linear fit between Γ and redshift resulted in a straight line of slope 6.0 ± 1.1 with reduced chi-square $\chi^2_{red} \approx 1.1$. Since the source spectral index is uncorrelated with the redshift (§2), a linear fit between these quantities should result in a constant line (a line with slope 0). Within 1-σ confidence limit, this corresponds to an EBL spectrum with $k = 2.4^{+1.2}_{-0.8} \times 10^{-3}\, cm^{-3}$ and $\epsilon_p = 5.2^{+3.8}_{-4.0}\, eV$, for which this condition can be achieved. We find that these constraints on k and ϵ_p are consistent with the one obtained earlier through nullifying the correlation between source VHE spectral index and redshift. In Figure 5, we show the allowed range of k and ϵ_p obtained by these two methods.

4. Discussions

The EBL spectrum presented in this work is estimated directly from the observed VHE spectra of HBL with the condition that the source spectrum should be uncorrelated with redshift. The main uncertainty lies in the assumption that the source VHE spectrum is a power law, and that approximate EBL spectral shape is given by equation (9). However, the latter is verified numerically to reproduce the observed spectrum which can be well represented by a power law. Interestingly, the present estimation does not depend on the nature of the radiative process active in HBL or dust/stellar emission models from galaxies, yet still agrees well with other estimates as shown in Figure 1. Moreover, though the 1-σ uncertainty range on the EBL spectrum is nearly a factor ~ 4, it is competitive compared to constraints put by observations and by other estimates. The predicted EBL spectrum is reasonably confined within the upper and lower limits (grey shaded area in Figure 1), obtained independently through observations (see §1). When compared

with the other EBL estimates, obtained through cosmological evolution models, the present one predicts stronger emission at lower energies but closely agrees at higher energies, though the predicted spectrum is not well constrained in this regime.

Deviation of the source spectrum from a power law may modify the EBL spectral shape described by equation (9) considerably. In such case, the present formalism needs to be modified by studying the correlation of other suitable observables instead of the power law spectral indices. However, the source spectrum of HBL (z<0.3) obtained using various EBL models are fitted resonably well by a power law and the one presented here agrees closely with these EBL models. To investigate further, we repeat the study considering the EBL spectral shape due to Franceschini et al. (2008), Gilmore et al. (2009), Finke et al. (2010) and Kneiske & Dole (2010). Following Abdo et al. (2010); Ackermann et al. (2012); H.E.S.S. Collaboration et al. (2013); Reesman & Walker (2013), we define the observed spectrum to be

$$F_o(E) = F_i(E_z) exp(-\tau_{theory}(E_z, z) \times b) \tag{10}$$

where τ_{theory} is the optical depth predicted by the above mentioned theoretical models, and b is a normalization factor required to assure that the de-absorbed spectral index is uncorrelated with the redshift. Then, $b = 1.0$ would imply that the particular model is consistent with the non correlation of the source VHE index with redshift. For the models discussed above, we obtained $b_{Kneisnke} = 1.5^{-0.6}_{+0.7}$, $b_{Franschini} = 1.4^{-0.6}_{+0.7}$, $b_{Finke} = 1.1^{-0.5}_{+0.6}$ and $b_{Gilmore} = 1.6^{-0.5}_{+0.7}$. From these, one can argue that the EBL model due to Finke et al. (2010) very well supports the non correlation of the source VHE index with redshift; whereas, the deviation from this condition is observed to be maximum in case of Gilmore et al. (2009).

The EBL spectrum, estimated in this work, can be used to find the intrinsic spectral index of HBL, which can then be compared with the one predicted by the radiative models of HBL. Under leptonic models, the spectral energy distributions of HBL are well reproduced by considering synchrotron and synchrotron self Compton emission from a broken power-law distribution of

electrons. In such a case, the VHE spectrum corresponds to the high energy tail of the electron distribution. Similarly, the X-ray spectrum lying beyond the synchrotron peak is also governed by the high energy end of the electron distribution. Indeed, the X-ray-TeV correlation observed during flares further suggests that the same electron distribution is responsible for the emission at these energies (Takahashi et al. 1996). Hence, it can be argued that the spectral index at these energies is related to the high energy particle spectral index of the underlying electron distribution. If the Compton scattering responsible for the VHE emission occurs in the Thomson regime, then the corresponding spectral index ζ will be same as the X-ray spectral index, α_2. On the other hand, if the scattering process happens at the extreme Klein-Nishina regime, then the VHE spectral index will be $2\alpha_2 - \alpha_1$ (Tavecchio et al. 1998), where α_1 is the optical spectral index reflecting the low energy electron spectral index. In general, the VHE index is expected to lie in between these two limits. To examine this, we compare the intrinsic VHE spectral index, computed in this work, with the X-ray spectral indices of the sources for which simultaneous/contemporaneous observations are available from *Swift*-XRT/*Suzaku*/*XMM*-Newton/*Swift*-BAT observations (Table 1). In Figure 6, we plot the intrinsic VHE spectral indices against the X-ray spectral indices with the limiting lines corresponding to Thomson and extreme Klein-Nishina regimes. For the latter limit, we assume the optical spectral index as $1/3$ since this limits the hardest synchrotron spectrum attainable (Pacholczyk 1973). Interestingly, all the sources are constrained well within these limits thereby supporting the afore mentioned interpretation.

The analysis done in this work was possible because the intrinsic variation of spectral index for HBL is relatively small. The fractional root mean square deviation (f_{rms}) of the de-absorbed VHE indices is 0.16, which is comparable to that of the X-ray ($f_{rms,X} = 0.14$) and the low energy GeV gamma-rays ($f_{rms,GeV} = 0.12$). The VHE index f_{rms} is significantly less than the index change due to absorption $\Delta\Gamma \sim 2$ at a redshift of $z = 0.266$. If the variation of index was comparable to the change due to absorption, the effect would not have been detectable. Since f_{rms} is considerably smaller than $\Delta\Gamma$, this leaves the exciting possibility that the uncertainty in EBL,

predicted by the present study, can be significantly reduced with increased number of blazars detected at VHE energies.

The work presented here is similar to the EBL upper limits proposed by Schroedter (2005) and Finke & Razzaque (2009). They studied the steepening of VHE spectral index with increase in redshift and attributed it to the absorption by EBL. Schroedter (2005) suggested an upper limit on EBL by assuming that the source spectral index, ζ, cannot be harder than 1.8, whereas Finke & Razzaque (2009) considered limits for ζ as 1 and 1.5. Following a similar procedure, Yang & Wang (2010) proposed an EBL upper limit by considering *Fermi*-LAT spectral index as an allowed limit on ζ. In this work, we systematically study the steepening of the VHE spectra of HBL with respect to redshift and exploit it to estimate the EBL spectrum. In addition, we do not impose any limits on ζ; instead, the derived value of ζ, using the current EBL, lies well within our present understanding of blazar emission models (Figure 6).

Lately, various EBL estimates have been proposed, exploiting the properties of TeV blazars under unique techniques. Mazin & Raue (2007) and Meyer et al. (2012) estimated an upper limit on EBL by employing splines. From the observed VHE spectra of blazars, they converged to a particular shape of EBL, which leads to a de-absorbed spectra that are physically acceptable under the present understanding of blazars. Mankuzhiyil et al. (2010); Domínguez et al. (2013) and Singh et al. (2014) reproduced the broadband SED of VHE blazars under leptonic model and thereby predicting the intrinsic VHE spectra. Comparing this with the observed VHE spectra, they estimated the optical depth for the attenuation of VHE gamma rays. While Mankuzhiyil et al. (2010) used this to show the inconsistency among various EBL models interpreted theoretically, Singh et al. (2014) showed a systematic deviation of the optical depths towards high energy; between the estimated and the ones predicted by various EBL models. Domínguez et al. (2013) used the estimated optical depths to determine the cosmic gamma ray horizon. Reesman & Walker (2013) considered the EBL models by Franceschini et al. (2008);

Gilmore et al. (2009); Domínguez et al. (2011) to estimate the optical depth for the VHE sources at $z \sim 0.1$. The optical depth is then scaled by a parameter to reproduce the observed flux for a range of de-absorbed spectral indices. Based on this scaling parameter, they concluded that these EBL models are consistent with the observed spectra, though the error on the parameter is large. Unlike these models, the work presented here does not have any bias on blazar emission models or a particular EBL shape. Instead, it relies upon the observed correlation between the VHE spectral index and redshift, along with the assumption that the de-absorbed VHE spectra is a power law.

Finally, like other EBL models, the EBL spectrum presented in this work predicts very large opacities for VHE photons from distant sources, e.g. 3C 279 at $z = 0.536$ and PKS 1424+240 at $z > 0.6$ (MAGIC Collaboration et al. 2008; Furniss et al. 2013). This is evident from Figure 2, where deviation of the observed VHE index from the best fit line is large for distant sources. This remains an open problem and may possibly be related to VHE emission through secondary processes resulting from the development of electromagnetic and hadronic cascades in the intergalactic medium (Essey & Kusenko 2010) or more exotic scenarios associated with creation of axion like particles (de Angelis et al. 2009). With the help of present high sensitivity VHE telescopes and future telescopes, like CTA (Cherenkov Telescope Array), these uncertainties can be cleared, providing more insight into our cosmic evolution.

5. Acknowledgements

The authors thank the anonymous referee for his valuable comments and suggestions. AS thanks Varsha Chitnis for helpful discussions and support. This research has made use of TeV catalog (http://tevcat.uchicago.edu/) created and maintained by Scott Wakely And Deirdre Horan and partially supported by NASA and the NSF.

Source name	z	Γ	E_{VHE}	α_2	α_f	Ref
Mkn421	0.031	2.72 ± 0.12	0.2 - 10	2.58 ± 0.03	1.771 ± 0.012	1
Mkn501	0.034	2.79 ± 0.12	0.1 - 2.0	2.42 ± 0.01	1.738 ± 0.027	2
1ES 2344+514*	0.044	2.95 ± 0.20	0.2 - 2.0	2.62 ± 0.50	1.716 ± 0.08	3
Mkn180	0.045	3.30 ± 0.70	0.2 - 6.6	-	1.74 ± 0.083	4
1ES 1959+650	0.048	2.58 ± 0.18	0.2 - 2.5	2.19 ± 0.02	1.937 ± 0.031	5
1ES 1727+502	0.055	2.70 ± 0.50	0.15 - 2.0	-	2.0 ± 0.2	6
PKS 0548−322*	0.069	2.86 ± 0.34	0.3 - 4.0	2.28 ± 0.23	-	7
PKS 2005−489	0.071	3.00 ± 0.22	0.4 - 4.0	2.46 ± 0.01	1.779 ± 0.047	8
RGB J0152+017	0.080	2.95 ± 0.36	0.1 - 4.0	-	1.788 ± 0.137	9
BZB J0013-1854	0.095	3.4 ± 0.10	0.2 - 2.0	-	1.96 ± 0.2	10
1ES 1312-423	0.105	2.85 ± 0.7	0.2 - 4.0	-	1.4 ± 0.4	11
PKS 2155−304	0.116	3.34 ± 0.10	1.0 - 10.	2.36 ± 0.01	1.838 ± 0.015	12
B3 2247+381	0.119	3.20 ± 0.60	0.1 - 2.0	-	1.837 ± 0.113	13
H 1426+428*	0.129	3.50 ± 0.40	0.3 - 2.00	2.54 ± 0.24	1.316 ± 0.123	14
1ES 1215+304	0.130	2.96 ± 0.14	0.1 - 1.51	2.29 ± 0.16	2.019 ± 0.036	15
1ES 0806+524	0.138	3.60 ± 1.00	0.3 - 1.02	2.67 ± 0.08	1.938 ± 0.057	16
BZB J1010−3119	0.143	3.08 ± 0.42	0.25 - 3.0	2.15 ± 0.06	2.239 ± 0.142	17
RX J0648+1516	0.179	4.40 ± 0.80	0.2 - 0.65	2.51 ± 0.06	1.737 ± 0.106	18
RBS 0413	0.190	3.18 ± 0.68	0.3 - 1.0	2.22 ± 0.07	1.551 ± 0.112	19
1ES 1011+496	0.212	4.00 ± 0.50	0.15 - 0.8	-	-	20
PKS 0301−243	0.266	4.60 ± 0.70	0.1 - 5	2.51 ± 0.1	1.938 ± 0.031	21
IC310	0.019	1.96 ± 0.22	0.12 - 8.1	-		22
RGB J0710+591*	0.125	2.69 ± 0.22	0.3 - 7.9	2.29 ± 0.26		23
1ES0229+200	0.140	2.50 ± 0.19	0.5 - 15.0	2.16 ± 0.28		24

H 2356-309	0.165	3.09 ± 0.24	0.2 - 1.04	2.43 ± 0.11		25
1ES 1218+304	0.182	3.08 ± 0.40	0.1 - 2	-		26
1ES 1101−232	0.186	2.94 ± 0.20	0.1 - 0.66	2.32 ± 0.02		27
1ES 0347−121*	0.188	3.10 ± 0.23	0.3 - 3	2.27 ± 0.30		28
1ES 0414+009	0.287	3.40 ± 0.50	0.2 - 0.70	2.40 ± 0.10		29
HESS J1943+213	0.14	3.1 ± 0.30				30
1ES 1440+122	0.163	3.4 ± 0.7				31
PKS 0447-439	0.175	3.8 ± 0.4				32
1ES 0502+675	0.341	3.9 ± 0.4				33
PG 1553+113	0.5 ± 0.08	4.1 ± 0.3				34
PKS 1424+240	0.604	4.2 ± 0.7				35

Table 1:: The list of HBL detected in VHE. The middle group lists the extreme HBLS and the bottom one with uncertain redshift. Column description 1: the Source name, 2: the redshift (z), 3: Observed VHE spectral index (Γ), 4: Observed VHE energy range (in TeV), 5: X-ray Spectral Index (quantities with * are obtained from *Swift*-BAT) 6. The *Fermi*-LAT average index, and 7: References:

1. Aleksić et al. (2012c) 2. Anderhub et al. (2009) 3. Albert et al. (2007b) 4. Albert et al. (2006) 5. Tagliaferri et al. (2008) 6. Aleksić et al. (2014a) 7. Aharonian et al. (2010) 8. H.E.S.S. Collaboration et al. (2011) 9. Aharonian et al. (2008) 10. H.E.S.S. Collaboration et al. (2013a) 11. HESS Collaboration et al. (2013) 12. Aharonian et al. (2009) 13. Aleksić et al. (2012a) 14 .Petry et al. (2002) 15.Aleksić et al. (2012b) 16.Acciari et al. (2009a) 17. H.E.S.S. Collaboration et al. (2012) 18. Aliu et al. (2011) 19. Aliu et al. (2012a) 20. Albert et al. (2007a) 21. H.E.S.S. Collaboration et al. (2013b) 22. Aleksić et al. (2014b) 23. Acciari et al. (2010) 24. Aharonian et al. (2007b) 25. Aharonian et al. (2006b) 26. Acciari et al. (2009b) 27. Reimer et al. (2008) 28. Aharonian et al. (2007a) 29.Aliu et al. (2012b) 30 - 35. www.tevcat.edu



Fig. 1.—: The best fit EBL spectrum estimated in this work (thick black line) and the $1-\sigma$ (checkered orange region) and $2-\sigma$ constrains (striped pink region) compared with the different theoretical models of Franceschini (Franceschini et al. (2008)), Gilmore (Gilmore et al. (2009)), Finke (Finke et al. (2010)) and Kneiske (Kneiske & Dole (2010)) . The solid grey region shows the upper and lower limits estimated from various observations (Dwek & Krennrich 2013).



Fig. 2.—: Distribution of the observed VHE spectral index of the selected HBL with redshift. The black stars correspond to extreme HBL and blue open diamonds are the ones with uncertain redshifts. The lower limits on the redshifts have been shown with solid (blue) arrows. The solid line (green) is the best fit straight line to the HBL denoted by filled circles (red).



Fig. 3.—: Distribution of the observed X-ray spectral index of HBL with redshift. The blue diamonds are from the *Swift*-BAT catalog (Baumgartner et al. 2013), the green circles from the *Beppo*-SAX catalog (Donato et al. 2005), and the red stars from archival X-ray catalog (Donato et al. 2001)



Fig. 4.—: Distribution of the observed VHE spectral index with luminosity of the HBL observed by the MAGIC telescope de Angelis et al. (2009).



Fig. 5.—: The $1-\sigma$ confidence region for the parameters k and ϵ_p obtained from the correlation study (green forward stripes) and the straight line fit (red backward stripes)



Fig. 6.—: Distribution of the calculated intrinsic TeV indices with X-ray indices. Solid line (blue) denotes the Thomson regime, whereas the dashed line (green) denotes extreme Klein-Nishina regime.

REFERENCES

Abdo, A. A., Ackermann, M., Ajello, M., et al. 2010, ApJ, 723, 1082

Acciari, V., Aliu, E., Arlen, T., et al. 2009a, ApJ, 690, L126

Acciari, V. A., Aliu, E., Arlen, T., et al. 2009b, ApJ, 695, 1370

—. 2010, ApJ, 715, L49

Ackermann, M., Ajello, M., Allafort, A., et al. 2011, ApJ, 743, 171

—. 2012, Science, 338, 1190

Aharonian, F., Akhperjanian, A. G., Bazer-Bachi, A. R., et al. 2006a, Nature, 440, 1018

—. 2006b, A&A, 455, 461

Aharonian, F., Akhperjanian, A. G., Barres de Almeida, U., et al. 2007a, A&A, 473, L25

—. 2007b, A&A, 475, L9

—. 2008, A&A, 481, L103

Aharonian, F., Akhperjanian, A. G., Anton, G., et al. 2009, ApJ, 696, L150

—. 2010, A&A, 521, A69

Albert, J., Aliu, E., Anderhub, H., et al. 2006, ApJ, 648, L105

—. 2007a, ApJ, 667, L21

—. 2007b, ApJ, 662, 892

Aleksić, J., Alvarez, E. A., Antonelli, L. A., et al. 2012a, A&A, 539, A118

—. 2012b, A&A, 544, A142

—. 2012c, A&A, 542, A100

Aleksić, J., Antonelli, L. A., Antoranz, P., et al. 2014a, A&A, 563, A90

—. 2014b, A&A, 563, A91

Aliu, E., Aune, T., Beilicke, M., et al. 2011, ApJ, 742, 127

Aliu, E., Archambault, S., Arlen, T., et al. 2012a, ApJ, 750, 94

—. 2012b, ApJ, 755, 118

Anderhub, H., Antonelli, L. A., Antoranz, P., et al. 2009, ApJ, 705, 1624

Baumgartner, W. H., Tueller, J., Markwardt, C. B., et al. 2013, ApJS, 207, 19

Böttcher, M. 2007, Ap&SS, 307, 69

Brown, R. W., Mikaelian, K. O., & Gould, R. J. 1973, Astrophys. Lett., 14, 203

Coppi, P. S., & Aharonian, F. A. 1999, ApJ, 521, L33

Costamante, L., & Ghisellini, G. 2002, A&A, 384, 56

De Angelis, A., Galanti, G., & Roncadelli, M. 2013, MNRAS, 432, 3245

de Angelis, A., Mansutti, O., Persic, M., & Roncadelli, M. 2009, MNRAS, 394, L21

Domínguez, A., Finke, J. D., Prada, F., et al. 2013, ApJ, 770, 77

Domínguez, A., Primack, J. R., Rosario, D. J., et al. 2011, MNRAS, 410, 2556

Donato, D., Ghisellini, G., Tagliaferri, G., & Fossati, G. 2001, A&A, 375, 739

Donato, D., Sambruna, R. M., & Gliozzi, M. 2005, A&A, 433, 1163

Dwek, E., & Krennrich, F. 2013, Astroparticle Physics, 43, 112

Essey, W., & Kusenko, A. 2010, Astroparticle Physics, 33, 81

Finke, J. D., & Razzaque, S. 2009, ApJ, 698, 1761

Finke, J. D., Razzaque, S., & Dermer, C. D. 2010, ApJ, 712, 238

Fossati, G., Maraschi, L., Celotti, A., Comastri, A., & Ghisellini, G. 1998, MNRAS, 299, 433

Franceschini, A., Rodighiero, G., & Vaccari, M. 2008, A&A, 487, 837

Furniss, A., Williams, D. A., Danforth, C., et al. 2013, ApJ, 768, L31

Ghisellini, G. 2011, in American Institute of Physics Conference Series, Vol. 1381, American Institute of Physics Conference Series, ed. F. A. Aharonian, W. Hofmann, & F. M. Rieger, 180–198

Gilmore, R. C., Madau, P., Primack, J. R., Somerville, R. S., & Haardt, F. 2009, MNRAS, 399, 1694

Gould, R. J., & Schréder, G. P. 1967a, Physical Review, 155, 1408

—. 1967b, Physical Review, 155, 1404

Guy, J., Renault, C., Aharonian, F. A., Rivoal, M., & Tavernet, J.-P. 2000, A&A, 359, 419

Hauser, M. G., & Dwek, E. 2001, ARA&A, 39, 249

Hauser, M. G., Arendt, R. G., Kelsall, T., et al. 1998, ApJ, 508, 25

Helgason, K., & Kashlinsky, A. 2012, ApJ, 758, L13

H.E.S.S. Collaboration, Abramowski, A., Acero, F., et al. 2011, A&A, 533, A110

—. 2012, A&A, 542, A94

—. 2013a, A&A, 554, A72

—. 2013b, A&A, 559, A136

HESS Collaboration, Abramowski, A., Acero, F., et al. 2013, MNRAS, 434, 1889

H.E.S.S. Collaboration, Abramowski, A., Acero, F., et al. 2013, A&A, 550, A4

Kelsall, T., Weiland, J. L., Franz, B. A., et al. 1998, ApJ, 508, 44

Kneiske, T. M., & Dole, H. 2010, A&A, 515, A19

Madau, P., & Phinney, E. S. 1996, ApJ, 456, 124

Madau, P., & Pozzetti, L. 2000, MNRAS, 312, L9

MAGIC Collaboration, Albert, J., Aliu, E., et al. 2008, Science, 320, 1752

Mankuzhiyil, N., Persic, M., & Tavecchio, F. 2010, ApJ, 715, L16

Mazin, D., & Raue, M. 2007, A&A, 471, 439

Meyer, M., Raue, M., Mazin, D., & Horns, D. 2012, A&A, 542, A59

Orr, M. R., Krennrich, F., & Dwek, E. 2011, ApJ, 733, 77

Pacholczyk, A. G. 1973, Radio astrophysics. Non-thermal processes in galactic and extragalactic sources.

Petry, D., Bond, I. H., Bradbury, S. M., et al. 2002, ApJ, 580, 104

Prandini, E., Bonnoli, G., Maraschi, L., Mariotti, M., & Tavecchio, F. 2010, MNRAS, 405, L76

Primack, J. R., Bullock, J. S., & Somerville, R. S. 2005, in American Institute of Physics Conference Series, Vol. 745, High Energy Gamma-Ray Astronomy, ed. F. A. Aharonian, H. J. Völk, & D. Horns, 23–33

Reesman, R., & Walker, T. P. 2013, JCAP, 12, 22

Reimer, A., Costamante, L., Madejski, G., Reimer, O., & Dorner, D. 2008, ApJ, 682, 775

Sanchez, D. A., Fegan, S., & Giebels, B. 2013, A&A, 554, A75

Schroedter, M. 2005, ApJ, 628, 617

Singh, K. K., Sahayanathan, S., Tickoo, A. K., & Bhatt, N. 2014, New Astr., 27, 34

Stanev, T., & Franceschini, A. 1998, ApJ, 494, L159

Stecker, F. W., Malkan, M. A., & Scully, S. T. 2006, ApJ, 648, 774

Stecker, F. W., & Scully, S. T. 2006, ApJ, 652, L9

—. 2010, ApJ, 709, L124

Tagliaferri, G., Foschini, L., Ghisellini, G., et al. 2008, ApJ, 679, 1029

Takahashi, T., Tashiro, M., Madejski, G., et al. 1996, ApJ, 470, L89

Tanaka, Y. T., Stawarz, L., Finke, J., et al. 2014, ArXiv e-prints, arXiv:1404.3727

Tavecchio, F. 2014, MNRAS, 438, 3255

Tavecchio, F., Maraschi, L., & Ghisellini, G. 1998, ApJ, 509, 608

Urry, C. M., & Padovani, P. 1995, PASP, 107, 803

Vassiliev, V. V. 2000, Astroparticle Physics, 12, 217

Wright, E. L. 1998, ApJ, 496, 1

Yang, J., & Wang, J. 2010, A&A, 522, A12

This manuscript was prepared with the AAS LaTeX macros v5.0.